

R E M A R K S

Claims 3-10, 14-20 and 23-25 are currently pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 19, 20, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0131571 (Costin) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,693, to Berger et al. (Berger). Claims 5, 9, 14, 15-18 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Costin in view of Berger, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,853 (Knight).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3-10, 14-20 and 23-25 is requested.

Since the issuance of the last Office Action, the undersigned and Examiner Gart have informally discussed the claims over the telephone. It was noted that the invention is focused on a depiction of a three dimensional object on which a design is selectively placed at a first location. A potential customer is able to view the object from at least two different perspectives with the design at the same, first location in each of the different perspective views. This gives the potential customer the ability to simulate an actual inspection of a three dimensional object from different perspectives with a design thereon.

It was pointed out to the Examiner that the prior art cited by the Examiner does not in any combination teach or make obvious this concept.

Costin permits a user to view either the front or back of an object. At best, Costin allows a user to view a design element **as it would appear at two separate locations** on the object. If the design element is put in the front of Costin's object, it is unviewable from the rear. If the design element is put in the rear of Costin's object, it is unviewable from the front. On the other hand, with applicant's claimed method and apparatus, a design element is placed at a single location and selectively viewable from two different perspectives.

The Examiner cites Berger for the disclosure of perspective/three-dimensional views. The basic concept taught in Berger does not vary from Costin. That is, if one combines Berger's teachings with Costin, one still only arrives at a system wherein an object with a design element at any location thereon would be viewable through the system from only a single perspective.

Knight is relied upon for the disclosure of changing the image of a cap. Knight lacks any disclosure that would teach or make obvious modification of Costin 's basic structure to have the functionality set forth in the applicant's claims. That is, Knight does not add anything to the disclosure of Costin and/or Berger relating to the ability to view from different perspectives an object having a design element that remains at the same location as viewed from different perspectives.

During the informal conversations with Examiner Gart, it was suggested that the claim language be clarified to highlight the above method and structural distinctions. It is believed that as amended, the structure and method are more clearly set forth.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3-10, 14-20 and 23-25 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: July 9, 2007